

Amendments to the Drawings:

FIG. 24 was objected to because the originally filed specification failed to provide support for the detailed work apparatus structure. Accordingly, the applicants present a replacement drawing of FIG. 24 wherein the new elements are represented in schematic or black box form as suggested by the Examiner in the action. Thus, a first housing part which can include a motor is identified by block 81 and a second housing part which can include a handle of the work apparatus is represented by a second box 82. FIG. 24 of the replacement drawing sheet should be in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) and the Examiner's approval thereof is respectfully requested.

Attachment: Replacement Sheet

 Annotated Sheet Showing Changes

Remarks

Claims 21 and 22 are amended. Claims 2 to 10, 12 to 16 and 20 to 22 are pending in this application of which only claim 20 is in independent form.

On page 3, paragraph 4, of the action, claims 21 and 22 were objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form. Claim 21 was shown as being dependent from cancelled claim 1 and the Examiner correctly interpreted claim 21 as being dependent from claim 20. Claim 21 is amended so that it is now dependent from claim 20 so that claims 21 and 22 should now be in compliance with 37 CFR 1.75(c).

Claims 21 and 22 were rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, because claim 21 had recited that the spring constant is high when the antivibration unit is under load and the original disclosure was deemed to support only a higher or increased spring constant due to the contact as a function of the change in spacing or play between the spring and the base of the guide slot. Claim 21 is amended herein to recite that the spring stiffness is reduced when the antivibration unit is not subjected to load and that the spring stiffness is increased when the antivibration unit is under load. The antecedent basis for the subject matter of claim 21 is provided, for example, by FIG. 4 and the description thereof starting at page 6, line 17, of the applicants' disclosure.

FIG. 4 is a schematic of the guide element with the coil spring under load. The number of spring-acting turns is reduced

and therefore the spring stiffness of the coil spring is increased as noted on page 6, lines 22 and 23:

"The number of spring-acting turns is reduced and therefore the spring stiffness of the coil spring 2 is increased."

As amended, claim 21 should now have adequate antecedent basis in the disclosure.

Claims 2 to 10, 12 to 16 and 20 to 22 were rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite because the last four lines of claim 20 recited that the spring stiffness of the antivibration unit increases because of the at least in part contact engagement of the turns of the transition section. In the action, this was compared to page 3, lines 9 to 13.

The disclosure is amended herein to conform the disclosure to what is shown in FIG. 4 of the applicants' drawings.

FIG. 3 shows the antivibration element for an unloaded coil spring and FIG. 4 shows the same coil spring under load. As shown in FIG. 4, the turns of the transition section 11 (for this reference numeral, please see FIG. 2) come at least in part into contact engagement with the helically-shaped slot 9 of the guide member 3 with the coil spring under load. In FIG. 4, it can be seen that the turns of the coil spring in the transition section 11 are in contact with the helically-shaped slot 9 above the longitudinal center axis 24 and that they are in spaced relationship to the slot 9 below the longitudinal center axis 24. Specifically, the turns of the transition section 11 come at least in part into contact engagement with the helically-shaped slot 9 and the disclosure is correspondingly amended on page 6 between lines 27 and 28 to recite what is clearly shown in

FIG. 4.

In view of the above, the last paragraph of claim 20 should now have clear antecedent support in the disclosure and drawings.

The description on page 3, lines 9 to 13, is amended so that it recites what is shown in FIG. 4 and should now therefore be consistent with the remainder of the specification and drawings considered as a whole. Claim 20 should now be definite as required by the statute.

Claim 22 is amended to delete the last four lines thereof referred to on page 5 of the action so that it too should no longer be indefinite.

Claims 2 to 10, 12 to 16 and 20 to 22 were not otherwise rejected so that these claims should now be allowable.

On page 3, paragraph 3, of the action, the abstract of the disclosure was objected to because it should be amended to include the limitation of increased stiffness. The abstract is amended herein to facilitate prosecution and should now be in compliance with MPEP §608.01(b).

The application should now be in condition for allowance.

Respectfully submitted,



Walter Ottesen
Reg. No. 25,544

Walter Ottesen
Patent Attorney
P.O. Box 4026
Gaithersburg, Maryland 20885-4026

Phone: (301) 869-8950

Date: May 23, 2006



Annotated Sheet Showing Changes
Serial No. 10/629,674

Fig. 24

